

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-16 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 13-16 have been amended and Claims 1-12 have been canceled. Support for the amendments to Claims 13-16 is found in paragraph [0114] of the specification. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 3, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter; Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0095937 A1, herein Knudson); Claims 1-4, 5, 7 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076378 A1) in view of Knudson; Claims 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui in view of Knudson and further in view of Sumita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,581,207 B1, hereinafter Sumita); and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui in view of Knudson and further in view of Herz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,087, hereinafter Herz).

Responsive to the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter, the claim has been amended as suggested in the Office Action to now recite “[a] computer readable medium encoded with a computer program to allow a computer to perform: ...”. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 13 recites:

a device configured to transmit information about a characteristic word selected by said user to a recording and playback apparatus; and

a second device configured to receive television program information about a television program corresponding to said selected characteristic word transmitted from said recording and playback apparatus as a result of transmitting information about said selected characteristic word.

Independent Claims 15 and 16 recite similar subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that these features are neither disclosed by nor rendered obvious by Knudson, Omoigui, Sumita, Herz or any conceivable combination thereof.

Knudson states in paragraph [0062] “[t]he search may be performed in database 36 or 45 by the user equipment 26 or 28, or alternatively in database 24 at television distribution facility 20 when a client-server architecture is used (FIG. 1).” Knudson further shows in FIG. 2 that after program listings are searched for programming matching a selected category in box 76 that the display displays the search result in box 78. That is, Knudson fails to describe a device configured to transmit information about a characteristic word selected by said user to a recording and playback apparatus. Further, Knudson fails to describe a second device configured to receive television program information about a television program corresponding to said selected characteristic word transmitted from said recording and playback apparatus as a result of transmitting information about said selected characteristic word. Therefore, Knudson fails to describe the features of Claim 13 quoted above and the similar recitations recited in Claims 15 and 16.

Nor do Omoigui, Sumita or Herz correct the deficiencies of Knudson pointed out above. Neither of these references describes the transmission of information about a characteristic word selected by a user to a recording and playback apparatus. Nor do they describe a device configured to receive television program information about a television program corresponding to said selected characteristic word transmitted from said recording and playback apparatus as a result of transmitting information about said selected

characteristic word. Therefore, neither of these references describes the features of Claim 13 quoted above or the similar recitations of Claims 15 and 16.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 14 is patentable at least for the reasons argued above with regard to Claim 13 from which it depends.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 13-16 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that Claims 13-16 be found allowable.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Michael L. Gellner
Registration No. 27,256